Case 3:13-cr-00713-JSC Document 4 Filed 11/21/13 Page 1 of 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR - 13 713 mag
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TO UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
HEMAN: PATEL	
Defendant.) Samuel Sam
Speedy Trial Act from $\sqrt{2}$, 2013 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of	rd on 1/2, ,2013, the Court excludes time under the 2/1/9, 2014 and finds that the ends of justice served the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance we See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)	ould be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of to or law, that it is unreasonable to	aplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial plished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	ould deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	ould unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ommitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	ould unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time on, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: 11 /21/13	JOHN JOHN SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: 1 on 1 Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney